



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/672,145

09/27/2000

Thomas E. Saulpaugh

5181-67300

6194

7590

12/19/2005

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/672,145

Applicant(s)

SAULPAUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron Strange

Art Unit

2153

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 55-58.

Claim(s) objected to: 6-10, 15, 18-20, 29-34, 38-40, 46, 47, 53, 60-62, 65 and 66.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 11-14, 16, 17 and 22-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attachment.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. With regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that "Bittinger does not allow or disallow access by a client based on client application address and ticket identifier", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The client application address and ticket identifier are used in starting the application. Without the appropriate ticket identifier, the correct ticket stub cannot be retrieved, and the application will not be started (Col 7, Lines 32-57)
3. With further regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that Bittinger "fails to teach or suggest the service examining the credential", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bittinger clearly discloses that the credential is used by the service, as Bitinger states "Using parameters, such as client application address...and the identifier for the ticket 20, the authentication server 26 executes the client application command to start 'MyApp'". In order for the authentication server to use the credential to start a program, it must be examined for authenticity. If the credential is not authentic, the authentication server will not be able to retrieve the appropriate ticket stub (Col 7, Lines 41-43).

4. With further regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that there is no basis for the assertion that "Bittinger's authentication server does not perform any operation if it determines that the client application address and ticket identifier are not authentic", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is apparent that if the credential is not authentic, the authentication server will not be able to retrieve the appropriate ticket stub and start the application, since the stub is used when starting the application (Col 7, Lines 41-43).

5. With further regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that "Bittinger's tstamp cannot be considered any sort of credential", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. This was previously addressed in the Office action of 9/23/2005 (¶4), and the rationale set forth there is maintained.

6. With further regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that "the cited passages do not mention that the tstamp is included in all messages that represent a method call", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The "method calls" taught by Bittinger are requests to start an application. Since the appropriate stub must be retrieved before the application may be started, all messages requesting to start an application must include a tstamp (Col 7, Lines 41-49).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS
12/9/2005